



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,491	12/27/2001	James D. Linder	014208.1484	1247

46629 7590 03/09/2005

BAKER BOTTS, LLP
2001 ROSS AVENUE, 6TH FLOOR
DALLAS, TX 75201

EXAMINER

PITARO, RYAN F

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/034,491	Applicant(s) LINDER, JAMES D.	
	Examiner Ryan F Pitaro	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-23 have been examined.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 6 and 23 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the preamble of the claims, the applicant states "The system of data processing system of..." since the claims inherit the limitations of the claim it depends on "The data processing system of..." is sufficient. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3,7-9,12-14,18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bigelow ("Bigelow", US 6,647,305).

As per independent claim 1, Bigelow discloses a data processing system, comprising: a user interface operable to display information to a user and to receive commands from a user accessing a digital model data set (Figure 4, Column 5 lines 36-42); a digital model data set comprising data associated with the form of mechanical structures (Figure 4, *bolt*); and a business process attribute data set linked to the digital

model data set such that various elements within the digital model data set are linked to business process attributes within the business process attribute data set such that users of the data processing system are displayed business process attribute display elements when a display element associated with a mechanical component defined by the digital model data set is displayed to the user (Figure 4 item 402; Column 6 lines 20-29).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Bigelow discloses a system wherein the business process attribute comprises quality information defining a quality level parameter associated with a component represented in the digital model data set (Column 5 lines 64-67; *wherein properties corresponding to web objects which define properties of quality such as the material composition*).

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Bigelow discloses a system wherein the business process attribute comprises safety information defining a safety level parameter associated with a component represented in the digital model data set (Column 5 lines 64-67; *wherein properties corresponding to web objects which define properties of safety such as the tolerance*).

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Bigelow discloses a system further comprising a knowledge base data set engine coupled to and operable to access various knowledge base data sets, the knowledge base data set engine operable to inferentially apply business process attributes to features within the digital model data set responsive to information linked to such features within the knowledge base data

sets accessible to the knowledge base data set engine (Column 7 lines 15-29; *inferentially applying web objects to specific CAD objects properties*).

As per claim 8, which is dependent on claim 7, Bigelow discloses a system wherein the knowledge base data set engine is operable to automatically inferentially apply a quality information business process attribute to a feature included within the digital model data set. (Column 7 lines 25-30; wherein properties can be defined Column 7 lines 50-53).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 7, Bigelow discloses a system wherein the knowledge base data set engine is operable to automatically inferentially apply a safety information business process attribute to a feature included within the digital model data set (Column 7 lines 25-30; wherein properties can be defined Column 7 lines 50-53).

Claim 12 is similar in scope to that of claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 13,19 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 2, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 14,20 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to that of claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4,10,15,21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bigelow ("Bigelow", US 6,647,305) in view of Keohane et al ("Keohane", US 2003/0001891).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Bigelow fails to distinctly point out a revision parameter associated with a component. However, Keohane teaches a system wherein the business process attribute comprises revision information defining a revision parameter associated with a component represented in the digital model data set ([0026] lines 4-16; *noting the revisions*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of Bigelow with the teaching of Keohane. Motivation to do so would be to provide a visual way of notifying a change in the object.

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 7, Bigelow fails to distinctly point out a revision parameter associated with a component. However, Keohane teaches a system wherein the business process attribute comprises revision information defining a revision parameter associated with a component represented in the digital model data set ([0026] lines 4-16; *noting the revisions*). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of Bigelow with the teaching

of Keohane. Motivation to do so would be to provide a visual way of notifying a change in the object.

Claims 15,21 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 5,6,11,15,16,22,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bigelow ("Bigelow", US 6,647,305) in view of McCloskey et al ("McCloskey", US 2002/0026385).

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Bigelow fails to distinctly point out a network address associated with information related to a component. However, McCloskey teaches a system wherein the business process attribute comprises an information address attribute comprising a network address associated with information related to a component associated with data within the digital model data set (Figure 4B). Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the system of Bigelow with the teaching of McCloskey. Motivation to combine would have been to provide an active drawing so that information about the component or object can be accessed quickly.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 5, Bigelow –McCloskey discloses a system wherein the information address attribute comprises a hypertext link address that when displayed to a user of the system and activated by the user of a system will

result in the activation of a browser program which is operable to retrieve information stored at the information attribute hypertext link address (McCloskey, Figure 4B).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 7, Bigelow –McCloskey discloses a system wherein the knowledge base data set engine is operable to automatically inferentially apply an information address link attribute to a feature included within the digital model data set (McCloskey, Figure 4B).

Claims 16,22 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 17,23 are individually similar in scope to that of claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- US006611725B1 teaches a CAD system generating tag data for revisions and annotations for additional information can be attached to the objects.
- US 20030098862A1 teaches interactive links corresponding with the CAD object providing information about an object's parts.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan F Pitaro whose telephone number is 571-272-

Art Unit: 2174

4071. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm Monday -Thursday, and alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on 571-272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan Pitaro
Art Unit 2174
Patent Examiner

RFP

Application/Control Number: 10/034,491

Page 9

Art Unit: 2174

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100